

IUHET 387
April 1998

CPT AND LORENTZ TESTS IN THE STANDARD MODEL^a

V. ALAN KOSTELECKÝ
Physics Department, Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405, U.S.A.
Email: kostelec@indiana.edu

A general Lorentz-violating extension of the minimal $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ standard model is described, including both CPT-even and CPT-odd terms. Some theoretical properties and experimental implications are given. The extension can be regarded as a low-energy limit of a physically relevant Lorentz-covariant fundamental theory in which spontaneous Lorentz violation occurs.

1 Introduction

The minimal $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ standard model provides an accurate phenomenological description of nature at energies low compared to the Planck scale M_P . The model is presumably the low-energy limit of a fundamental theory that consistently combines gravity and quantum mechanics. Experiments with present technology searching for effects from this fundamental theory must contend with the difference between the electroweak scale m_W and M_P , which is about 17 orders of magnitude and is likely to induce a strong suppression of possible signals. This makes it of interest to identify experiments that are of exceptional sensitivity and are seeking effects excluded in conventional renormalizable gauge theories. One approach is to look for qualitatively new physics in candidate fundamental theories. For example, in string (M) theory there are qualitatively new effects expected at the Planck scale, and one can consider the possibility of associated low-energy signals.

In this talk, I examine the idea that the new physics involves a spontaneous violation of Lorentz symmetry.¹ This occurs in theories with Lorentz-covariant dynamics that exhibit field interactions destabilizing the naive vacuum and inducing nonzero expectation values for Lorentz tensors. Certain string theories may be of this type. If the nonzero tensor expectation values are oriented in the physical four spacetime dimensions, apparent Lorentz violations could occur at the level of the standard model.

^aPresented at PASCOS 98, Northeastern University, Boston, March 1998

The Lorentz transformations are linked to the discrete transformations of charge conjugation C, parity reflection P, and time reversal T through the CPT theorem.² Under mild assumptions, this theorem implies that CPT must be a symmetry of local relativistic quantum field theories. It follows that violations of both Lorentz and CPT symmetry would represent potentially observable signals arising at the level of the fundamental theory and lying outside conventional renormalizable gauge theory. With the expected severe suppression, only specialized experiments would be sensitive to such effects.

2 Standard-Model Extension and QED Limit

The effects of spontaneous Lorentz and CPT breaking at the level of the standard model can be treated by including certain terms that appear to violate these symmetries. A general Lorentz-violating extension of the minimal $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ standard model that includes both CPT-even and CPT-odd terms exists.³ The usual gauge invariances and gauge symmetry breaking are valid and the theory is hermitian and power-counting renormalizable. At present, this standard-model extension seems to be the only candidate for a consistent extension of the standard model providing a microscopic theory of Lorentz violation. It must be the low-energy limit of any fundamental theory (not necessarily string theory) that generates the standard model and contains spontaneous Lorentz and CPT violation.

Although Lorentz symmetry is spontaneously broken, the standard-model extension retains many attractive features of Lorentz-covariant theories.³ One reason is that Lorentz symmetry holds in the underlying fundamental theory, so properties such as microcausality and positivity of the energy are expected to hold. Standard quantization methods are unaffected, and energy and momentum are conserved if the tensor expectation values arising from the symmetry breaking are independent of spacetime position. Also, the standard-model extension remains invariant under rotations or boosts of the observer's inertial frame (*observer* Lorentz transformations). Lorentz violations arise only through the existence of nonzero tensor expectation values in the vacuum, which are revealed by rotations or boosts of the (localized) fields only (*particle* Lorentz transformations).

The usual standard model disregards gravitational effects, and the same is true of the Lorentz-violating extension. This means the broken particle Lorentz symmetry appears as a global symmetry, so Nambu-Goldstone modes might be expected. The effect of these modes would be of interest if gravity were included, since local Lorentz invariance would be involved. In gauge theories, if global symmetries are promoted to local ones then the Higgs mechanism can

occur, modifying the propagator of the gauge fields to generate a mass and eliminating the Nambu-Goldstone modes. However, in a theory with gravity there is no gravitational Higgs effect: the graviton propagator can be modified if a Lorentz tensor acquires a nonzero expectation value, but no mass for the graviton arises because the gravitational connection involves derivatives of the metric.¹

The standard-model extension may be constructed by adding all possible Lorentz-violating terms that are compatible with spontaneous symmetry breaking in an underlying theory and that preserve $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge invariance and power-counting renormalizability. The explicit form of the extension, including both CPT-even and CPT-odd terms, can be found in the literature.³

The existence of numerous sensitive experimental tests of CPT and Lorentz invariance in the context of quantum electrodynamics (QED) makes it of value to consider associated limiting cases of the standard-model extension. These limits are generalizations of QED that include modifications in both the fermion and the photon sectors allowing for possible Lorentz and CPT violations.³ For the special case of the extended theory of photons, electrons, and positrons, the associated lagrangian has a relatively simple form. The usual terms are:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{QED}} = \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(\frac{1}{2}i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\mu - qA_\mu)\psi - m\bar{\psi}\psi - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \quad . \quad (1)$$

There are two CPT-violating terms in the fermion sector and one in the photon sector:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_e^{\text{CPT}} &= -a_\mu\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi - b_\mu\bar{\psi}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu\psi \quad , \\ \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{\text{CPT}} &= \frac{1}{2}(k_{AF})^\kappa\epsilon_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}A^\lambda F^{\mu\nu} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Certain Lorentz-violating but CPT-preserving terms are also possible:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_e^{\text{Lorentz}} &= c_{\mu\nu}\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(\frac{1}{2}i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}^\nu - qA^\nu)\psi + d_{\mu\nu}\bar{\psi}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu(\frac{1}{2}i\overleftrightarrow{\partial}^\nu - qA^\nu)\psi - \frac{1}{2}H_{\mu\nu}\bar{\psi}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\psi \\ \mathcal{L}_\gamma^{\text{Lorentz}} &= -\frac{1}{4}(k_F)_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}F^{\kappa\lambda}F^{\mu\nu} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The various coefficients appearing in the above terms play the role of Lorentz- and CPT-violating couplings and are expected to be suppressed by many orders of magnitude. Information about the notation used above can be found in the literature,³ along with more details about related issues. For example, field redefinitions can be used to show that certain components of the coupling coefficients are physically unobservable.

3 Experimental Tests

Although many tests of Lorentz invariance and CPT exist, most are insensitive to effects in the standard-model extension because the coupling coefficients are small. However, some experiments provide interesting constraints. The quantitative microscopic theory of Lorentz and CPT violation offered by the standard-model extension can be used both to analyze and compare bounds obtained from various experiments and to identify potential experimental signals. To date, investigations along these lines have been performed for possible bounds on CPT and Lorentz violations from measurements of neutral-meson oscillations,^{5,4,6,7} from tests of QED in Penning traps,^{8,9} from hydrogen and antihydrogen spectroscopy,^{10,11} from photon properties,³ and from baryogenesis.¹² In what follows, a brief outline of a few of these results is presented. Several other investigations are underway, including a study¹³ of limits attainable in clock-comparison experiments.¹⁴

3.1 Tests with Neutral-Meson Oscillations

First, consider interferometry with neutral K , D , B_d , or B_s mesons. Two types of (indirect) CP violation can be explored: T violation with CPT invariance, or CPT violation with T invariance. These can be described phenomenologically using complex parameters ϵ_P and δ_P , respectively, where the subscript P labels the type of neutral meson. The effective hamiltonian for the time evolution of a P -meson state incorporates ϵ_P and δ_P , so experiments investigating oscillations can provide some bounds on CPT violation.

An expression for the CPT-violating parameter δ_P can be derived in the context of the standard-model extension.⁷ It depends on only one type of coupling coefficient, arising from CPT-violating terms of the form $-a_\mu^q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q$, where q is a quark field and the coefficient a_μ^q is spacetime constant but varies with quark flavor q . The sensitivity of neutral-meson systems to a_μ^q is a consequence of the flavor-changing oscillations. Since none of the other experiments mentioned in this talk involve flavor-changing effects, none can provide experimental signals for coupling coefficients of the type a_μ^q .

Potentially important effects arise because the CPT and Lorentz breaking generates a dependence of δ_P on the boost and orientation of the meson.⁷ Denote the P -meson four-velocity by $\beta^\mu \equiv \gamma(1, \vec{\beta})$. Then, the standard-model extension implies that the expression

$$\delta_P \approx i \sin \hat{\phi} \exp(i \hat{\phi}) \gamma (\Delta a_0 - \vec{\beta} \cdot \Delta \vec{a}) / \Delta m \quad (4)$$

holds at leading order in all coupling coefficients. Here, $\hat{\phi} \equiv \tan^{-1}(2\Delta m / \Delta \gamma)$, where Δm and $\Delta \gamma$ are the mass and decay-rate differences between the P -

meson eigenstates, respectively, and $\Delta a_\mu \equiv a_\mu^{q_2} - a_\mu^{q_1}$, where q_1 and q_2 represent the valence-quark flavors in the P meson. For simplicity, various subscripts P have been omitted from variables on the right-hand side of Eq. (4).

Several consequences for experiment are implied by the form of Eq. (4). For one, the real and imaginary parts of δ_P are proportional.⁴ For another, the magnitude of δ_P can vary with P because the couplings a_μ^q are flavor dependent.⁴ Still others arise from the dependence of δ_P on the boost magnitude and orientation, suggesting a variety of possibilities for signals of Lorentz and CPT breaking.⁷ For instance, boosted mesons may exhibit larger CPT-violating effects, so otherwise comparable experiments seeking to bound δ_P might have different CPT reaches.

Among the neutral-meson systems, the most stringent bounds on CPT violation currently arise from measurements of kaon oscillations.⁵ Relatively little experimental information on CPT violation is available from other neutral-meson systems. Recently, two groups⁶ at CERN have undertaken an analysis to investigate the possibility⁴ that existing data can be used to place interesting CPT bounds. The OPAL collaboration has published the result $\text{Im } \delta_{B_d} = -0.020 \pm 0.016 \pm 0.006$, while the DELPHI collaboration has obtained a preliminary measurement $\text{Im } \delta_{B_d} = -0.011 \pm 0.017 \pm 0.005$. Other analyses are underway. Experiments of this type are important because it is possible that relatively large CPT violation exists for the heavier neutral mesons. If, for example, the magnitude of the coefficients a_μ^q increases with the mass of the quark q , as occurs with the conventional Yukawa couplings, then the largest signal of CPT violation might be expected in one of the B systems.

3.2 QED Tests

Next, consider some effects arising in the fermion sector of the extended QED. A major type of precision test involves the use of a Penning trap to confine individual particles for relatively long periods of time, during which high-accuracy measurements of, for instance, anomaly and cyclotron frequencies are made.⁸ The implications for these experiments of the CPT- and Lorentz-violating terms in the standard-model and QED extensions have been studied.⁹ Various signals and corresponding relevant figures of merit have been examined, and the Lorentz and CPT reach attainable in present and future experiments has been estimated. For instance, in the laboratory frame the spatial components of the coefficient b_μ are tightly constrained by experiments comparing electron and positron anomalous magnetic moments. The corresponding figure of merit for CPT and Lorentz violation could in principle be bounded with ex-

isting technology and a relatively minor change in experimental procedures to the level of roughly 10^{-20} . Similarly tight bounds on other coefficients in the fermion sector of the extended QED could be obtained from other experiments of this type.

Consider next the photon sector of the QED extension. It turns out that the CPT-even term appearing in Eq. (2) maintains a positive conserved energy.³ In contrast, the CPT-odd term in Eq. (2) can contribute negatively to the energy,¹⁵ which represents a potential theoretical difficulty and suggests the coefficient $(k_{AF})^\kappa$ should be zero.³ Moreover, it can be shown that the generalized Maxwell equations incorporating Lorentz violation describe two independent propagating degrees of freedom as usual, but that typically the two corresponding dispersion relations differ. The consequences of this include birefringence of the vacuum, with the Lorentz violation inducing effects on an electromagnetic wave similar to those displayed by conventional radiation propagating in an optically anisotropic and gyrotropic transparent crystal exhibiting spatial dispersion of the axes.

Various bounds on photon properties exist from terrestrial, astrophysical and cosmological experiments. Interesting constraints can be placed on the coefficients of the Lorentz-violating terms in the photon sector of the extended QED from the absence of birefringence on cosmological distance scales. At present, the components of the CPT-odd coefficient $(k_{AF})_\mu$ are restricted to $\lesssim 10^{-42}$ GeV,^{15,16} although there is a disputed claim^{17,18} for a nonzero effect at the level of $|\vec{k}_{AF}| \sim 10^{-41}$ GeV. Also, the rotation-invariant irreducible component of the CPT-even coefficient $(k_F)_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}$ is constrained to $\lesssim 10^{-23}$ by the existence of cosmic rays¹⁹ and other tests. The remaining irreducible components of $(k_F)_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}$ break rotation invariance and could in principle be experimentally bounded with existing techniques from measurements of cosmological birefringence,³ although this has not yet been done. The attainable bound on the magnitude of the dimensionless coefficient $(k_F)_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}$ is estimated to be of order 10^{-27} .

The stringent experimental bound on the components of $(k_{AF})_\mu$ is compatible with the zero value needed to minimize theoretical difficulties. The vanishing of $(k_{AF})_\mu$ imposes an interesting consistency check on the standard-model extension because one might expect $(k_{AF})_\mu$ to acquire radiative corrections from diagrams involving the CPT-violating couplings in the fermion sector, even if it is zero at tree level. However, it has been shown³ that one-loop radiative corrections are finite, so for one-loop renormalizability a tree-level CPT-odd term is unnecessary. Similar arguments may apply at higher-loop order, and it appears plausible to neglect the possible CPT-odd term in the photon sector.

In contrast, explicit calculations have shown³ that divergent radiative corrections to the CPT-even coefficients $(k_F)_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}$ do indeed arise at one loop, as might be expected. This is compatible with a nonzero renormalized coupling at the level accessible to feasible experiments on cosmological birefringence.

Acknowledgments

I thank Orfeu Bertolami, Robert Bluhm, Don Colladay, Rob Potting, Neil Russell, Stuart Samuel, and Rick Van Kooten for collaborations. This work was supported in part by the United States Department of Energy under grant number DE-FG02-91ER40661.

References

1. V.A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 224; *ibid.*, **66** (1991) 1811; Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 683; *ibid.*, **40** (1989) 1886; V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Nucl. Phys. B **359** (1991) 545; Phys. Lett. B **381** (1996) 89.
2. See, for example, R.G. Sachs, *The Physics of Time Reversal* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987).
3. D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 6760; preprint IUHET 359 (1997), Phys. Rev. D, in press (hep-ph/9809521).
4. V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, in D.B. Cline, ed., *Gamma Ray-Neutrino Cosmology and Planck Scale Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993) (hep-th/9211116); Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995) 3923; D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Lett. B **344** (1995) 259; Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 6224; V.A. Kostelecký and R. Van Kooten, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5585.
5. B. Schwingenheuer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 4376; L.K. Gibbons *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 6625; R. Carosi *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **237** (1990) 303.
6. OPAL Collaboration, R. Akerstaff *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **76** (1997) 401; DELPHI Collaboration, M. Feindt *et al.*, preprint DELPHI 97-98 CONF 80 (July 1997).
7. V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 1818.
8. P.B. Schwinberg, R.S. Van Dyck, Jr., and H.G. Dehmelt, Phys. Lett. A **81** (1981) 119; Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 722; L.S. Brown and G. Gabrielse, Rev. Mod. Phys. **58** (1986) 233; R.S. Van Dyck, Jr., P.B. Schwinberg, and H.G. Dehmelt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** (1987) 26; G. Gabrielse *et al.*, *ibid.*, **74** (1995) 3544.

9. R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecký and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 1432; Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 3932.
10. M. Charlton *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **241** (1994) 65; J. Eades, ed., *Antihydrogen*, J.C. Baltzer, Geneva, 1993.
11. R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecký and N. Russell, preprint IUHET 388, 1998 (hep-ph/9810269).
12. O. Bertolami *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **395** (1997) 178.
13. V.A. Kostelecký and C.D. Lane, in preparation.
14. V.W. Hughes, H.G. Robinson, and V. Beltran-Lopez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **4** (1960) 342; R.W.P. Drever, Philos. Mag. **6** (1961) 683; J.D. Prestage *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54** (1985) 2387; S.K. Lamoreaux *et al.*, *ibid.*, **57** (1986) 3125; T.E. Chupp *et al.*, *ibid.*, **63** (1989) 1541.
15. S.M. Carroll, G.B. Field, and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **41** (1990) 1231.
16. P. Haves and R.G. Conway, Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc. **173** (1975) 53P; J.N. Clarke, P.P. Kronberg and M. Simard-Normandin, *ibid.*, **190** (1980) 205.
17. B. Nodland and J.P. Ralston, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 3043; Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 1958; astro-ph/9706126.
18. S.M. Carroll and G.B. Field, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 2394; D.J. Eisenstein and E.F. Bunn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 1957; J.P. Leahy, astro-ph/9704285; J.F.C. Wardle, R.A. Perley and M.H. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 1801; T.J. Loredo, E.E. Flanagan and I.M. Wasserman, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 7507.
19. S. Coleman and S. Glashow, Phys. Lett. B **405** (1997) 249.